UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/456,270	12/07/1999	BRUCE J. KOKKO	2130(FJ-99-1	6225

			EXAMINER
40256	7590	07/27/2004	

FERRELLS, PLLC
P. O. BOX 312
CLIFTON, VA 20124-1706

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Notification of Non-Compliance With 37 CFR 1.192(c)	Application No. 09/456,270	Applicant(s) KOKKO, BRUCE J.	
	Examiner Steve Alvo	Art Unit 1731	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on *14 March 2004* is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 1.192(c). See MPEP § 1206.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file IN TRIPLICATE a complete new brief in compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c) within the longest of any of the following three **TIME PERIODS**: (1) **ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS** from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer; (2) **TWO MONTHS** from the date of the notice of appeal; or (3) within the period for reply to the action from which this appeal was taken. **EXTENSIONS OF THESE TIME PERIODS MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.**

1. ☐ The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 1.192(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.

2. ☐ The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, pending or cancelled, or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 1.192(c)(3)).

3. ☐ At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 1.192(c)(4)).

4. ☐ The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the claimed invention, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 1.192(c)(5)).

5. ☐ The brief does not contain a concise statement of the issues presented for review (37 CFR 1.192(c)(6)).

6. ☐ A single ground of rejection has been applied to two or more claims in this application, and

   (a) ☐ the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet presents arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.

   (b) ☐ the brief includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet does not present arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.

7. ☒ The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).

8. ☐ The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).

9. ☐ Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):

   Upon further review of this case was found that Applicant has not argued all the rejections as set forth by the Examiner. The rejections are alternative rejections one based on Formulation A and the other on Formulation B. Applicant has argued these rejections together, e.g. Formulation A and Formulation B, as if they were the same rejection. See Page 5, last paragraph of the Brief were Applivant states the rejection is Formulations A and B in view of Osborn, III and Back et al. This is not correct the rejetions are Formulation A in view of Osborn, II and Back et al; or Formulation B in view of Osborn, III and Back et al. These are two separate rejections, not a single rejection as argued by Appellant.

   The Tables in the Brief and attached Decleration only compare Formulation A with the instant invention, they do not compare Formulation B with the instant invention.

   The Brief does not list these alternative rejections as separate Issues.

Steve Alvo
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1731